



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/974,781

10/10/2001

Michael G. Kahn

FSTK 1004-1

8124

22470

7590

11/03/2006

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP

P O BOX 366

HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019

EXAMINER

COBANOGLU, DILEK B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3626

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	Application No. 09/974,781	Applicant(s) KAHN ET AL.	
	Examiner Dilek B. Cobanoglu	Art Unit 3626	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 October 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
 6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
 7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: none.
 Claim(s) objected to: none.
 Claim(s) rejected: 1-51.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
 9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See continuation sheet.
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
 13. ☐ Other: _____.


 G. LUKE GILLIGAN
 Primary PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11: Applicant disagrees that claims 1, 10 and 42 are rejected under U.S.C. section 112 for being indefinite. Applicant continues that "said protocol specification specifies such a parameter too vaguely to be encoded into said database or said protocol specification specifies such a parameter inconsistently" is clear because the database in the claim is not any regular database, it refers to a "said database". As stated in the previous final action, there are no specific and clear limits of the real values or parameters on these claims. There is no particular value indicate a parameter, which is "too vaguely". Also, since the parameter would be unknown in the claim, "protocol specification specifying such a parameter would be unclear, as explained in the previous final office action. Applicant disagrees with the 112 rejection of claims 1 and 42, because there is no sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation of "an indication that an operational uncertainty exists". "Identifying an operational uncertainty in which said protocol specification specifies such a parameter too vaguely" is not clear as explained in the previous office action and above, therefore "an indication that said operational uncertainty exists" does not have a sufficient antecedent basis for this limitation. The value of the parameter or the parameter being too vague is not clear in the claim, therefore "said protocol specification specifying such a parameter inconsistently" is not clear and indefinite as explained in the previous office action and above.

Applicant argues that Herren reference does not teach operational uncertainty, protocol specification fails to specify a particular parameter for use during protocol execution. At the March 2, 2006 interview, Examiners suggested that the method claim 1 and the rest of the claims would be amended to clarify the meaning of "operational uncertainty". With the broadest interpretation, Examiner respectfully submits that the combination of references Brown (6,196,970), Friedman (6,055,494) and Herren (6,108,635) teach these limitations as explained in the previous office action. (Brown; col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 4, col. 6, lines 19, 23, 43-45), (Herren; col. 5, line 45 to col. 6, line 7).